10780

# A LETTER

TO

## *THE REV. JOHN MARTIN;*

OCCASIONED BY

HIS LATE PUBLICATION

OF

A SERMON, PREACHED IN BROAD-STREET,

JANUARY 14, 1798.

---

"IT WAS NOT AN ENEMY THAT REPROACHED ME, THEN I "COULD HAVE BORNE IT—

"But, IT WAS THOU, A MAN, MINE EQUAL, MY GUIDE, *and* "*mine Acquaintance.*"

PSALM lv.

---

*LONDON:*

SOLD BY W. BUTTON, PATERNOSTER-ROW;
AND T. CONDER, BUCKLERSBURY.

BRITISH MUSEUM

# LETTER,

*&c. &c.*

REVEREND SIR,

WHEN I firſt heard the report reſpecting your Sermon, delivered at Broad-ſtreet on the 14th January, 1798, it excited ſome degree of ſurprize, as well as concern. I thought there might poſſibly have been ſome exaggeration in the report, till the concurring teſtimony of many individuals, entitled to credit, afforded abundant confirmation, that a charge of an heinous nature, had been publicly made by you, againſt a great number of perſons profeſſing Chriſtianity. Hearing, however, that in conſequence of remonſtrances made to you, reſpecting the impropriety of your conduct, you had determined to publiſh the Sermon containing the offenſive ſentiments; I waited until I had an opportunity of reading your publication, before I formed my concluſions reſpecting your conduct.

Having the evidence before me, I am now entitled to judge. As I have long entertained an eſteem for you, I ſhall offer you my remarks with freedom, though with proper deference to thoſe

traits in your character, which I may ſtill think deſerving of reſpect.

You will probably aſk, Who is he that has taken upon him to arraign my conduct? I reply, My obſervations are to be judged of by their propriety or impropriety, without regard to the quarter from whence they come. My name will not alter facts, nor is it of any conſequence to the public that the writer ſhould be known; ſuffice it to ſay, that I am not a ſubſcriber to the Broad-ſtreet Lecture, and therefore do not feel any *perſonal* intereſt in the diſcuſſion of the buſineſs.

I begin with your Preface. After a few preliminary remarks, you introduce a letter from Mr. Booth, which conveyed to you the firſt intimation that ſome obſervations in your Sermon had been productive of much diſſatisfaction, and inquietude, in the minds of your auditors. This you call an "*interrogating letter*," and obſerve, "*as I knew I* "*was not amenable to Mr. Booth, and as I* had *but* "*little* reaſon of late, to ſuppoſe he was my friend, "*it became me to be cautious.*" But does there not here appear a manifeſt contradiction, for on the 24th January you publicly alluded to Mr. B. as your "*venerable friend*," whom you inform us, you had little reaſon to ſuppoſe ſuch on the 19th January? To which account do you wiſh us to give credit? to the language of cautious ſuſpicion, or of confidence and eſteem? But, ſir, let me aſk, Is there any thing in the letter of Mr. B. on this occaſion, which breathes not the language of friendſhip,

friendſhip, tenderneſs, and concern? The inquiries, or "*interrogations*," if you pleaſe, are couched in terms which evidently diſcover the writer to have had a regard for your reputation, as a man, and as a miniſter. If you had been miſrepreſented, he wiſhed for information to ſtem the torrent of unfavourable report, which was faſt rolling on; and if an act of inadvertence, that he might plead your cauſe, and counteract, as far as lay in his power, the miſchievous tendency of ſuch report. I confeſs, I ſee nothing in this letter but what merited a fair and unequivocal reply, to one whom you conſidered as your "*venerable friend*." With this letter, contraſt your anſwer. Is it not a mixture of meanneſs and evaſion? The inquiry goes to matter of fact.—The anſwer ſays, "inform "me who are my accuſers?" Does it not ſeem as if conſcience was your accuſer, when you penned the anſwer? Does there not appear an evident wiſh to ſhun inveſtigation?—a conſcioufneſs of having done that which would not bear even the ſcrutiny of friendſhip?—or would you thus have treated that "*venerable and reſpectable friend*," under the paltry plea, that "it became me to be "cautious?" How much more would ingenuouſneſs have become you, than the ſubterfuge you have adopted? Mr. B. is a character that needs no panegyric; you well know he is worthy of confidence, and your own encomiums of his probity and worth, ought to have baniſhed far from your mind, every idea of miſtruſt in the man

whom

whom "*you love from your heart*," if ſuch a declaration was made with the leaſt degree of ſincerity.

In your narrative you proceed to inform us, that "on Thurſday the 24th, it was your lot to "preach at one of our Monthly Meetings; on "that day," you add, "I dined with the miniſ-"ters, and with a larger body of people than is "common on thoſe occaſions. After dinner, I "expected ſome animadverſions from an elder "brother; but, whatever might be his reaſons, "he choſe to forbear." Reflecting on this paragraph, I am not a little ſurprized at your obſervations. A few days before, this *elder brother* had ſent you a letter perfectly reſpectful in every view, to which you certainly returned by no means a reſpectful anſwer;—after you had thus refuſed to comply with his requeſt, in an epiſtolary way, how could you expect him to riſe up, in the company of probably not leſs than fifty perſons, and call you to account, publicly, for your conduct? Had he made the animadverſions in the preſence of this company, which you ſay "you expected," there might have been ſome grounds to queſtion the propriety of his conduct; but he wiſely forbore to introduce the unpleaſant ſubject upon that occaſion, and only evinced his diſapprobation of your conduct, by omitting to take any notice of you.

You next advert to the viſit paid you by the Managers of the Broad-ſtreet Lecture, who left you

you with ſufficient reaſon to expect you ſhould hear from them again. In a few days, you inform us, you received a note from the Treaſurer, accompanied with the proceedings of the Subſcribers to that Lecture. This note you have tranſcribed word for word, but as the recital of it was in no way connected with the reſolutions, was it generous, was it manly, to expoſe a trifling miſtake, which charity, that vaunteth not itſelf, would have attributed rather to inadvertence than to ignorance? Has the inſertion of this note done you any credit? Has it not drawn upon yourſelf that contempt, which you meant ſhould fall on the writer? Has it not lowered you in the eſtimation of others, in proportion, as you proudly thought, you roſe in ſuperiority to him?

The note, however, with all its inaccuracies, is *intelligible*. But were ſome of *your works* to be tried by this ſtandard, is there not reaſon to think they would be found wanting*?

Having made theſe obſervations, I now addreſs myſelf to the conſideration of that charge, which, it is ſaid, and confidently too, you brought againſt your auditory, and the Diſſenters in general.

I conſider it as of no real importance, whether the

* In proof of this, I refer you to the opinion of certain Critics, when reviewing one of your moſt conſiderable works, they obſerve, that "*the whole is either myſtical rant, or trifling "declamation, weakly conceived, and incorrectly expreſſed.*"

MONTHLY REVIEW, Vol. xxii. p. 351.

the gentlemen who conduct this Lecture have attended to literary propriety, either in their notes or resolutions: the true object of inquiry is, whether the accusations brought against you are substantially true or not? If it can be proved, that you have stood forth the "accuser of the "brethren;" that you have avowed those things laid to your charge, and refused to retract those declarations; every sober and dispassionate mind will, I presume, be inclined to think, that the Subscribers to the Lecture at Broad-street, *have done well*, in expressing their marked disapprobation of conduct so unbecoming the character you sustain.

You begin your Appendix by saying, that if this "discourse is not a correct copy of that "which I preached at Broad-street, it is certain "I have done my best to make it so; and the "public may be assured, the order of it is the "same, and that I have not suppressed a single "sentiment by design." In the following page you seem to be aware, that there possibly may be a difference of opinion between you and your hearers, as to the correct recital of the words spoken; and therefore you lay in your claim, to be considered as "competent to recollect as any "of your opposers." If, however, your opposers (as you call them) have not very bad memories (notwithstanding you may have done your best to recollect yourself) you have certainly failed in the attempt. There is abundant proof, that the

language

language you have publiſhed, was not the language you delivered from the pulpit: reſpectable perſons aſſert, the one was *materially* different from the other—that you have tranſpoſed, and added, and placed the words in a connection *to render them* much leſs objectionable than when they were delivered.

In page 29 you ſay, "But you will aſk, *Should* "any of my own denomination *actually* join the "French, and abet their cauſe, what I would ſay "to them? I would ſay to them,

——————— "Ye baptized infidels,
"Ye worſe for mending! waſh'd to fouler ſtains!"

Now, ſir, if my information be correct, and I apprehend it is, the words you delivered were *not* qualified by any ſuppoſition; but, were a broad and naked aſſertion that ſuch *would be* the caſe, if the enemy were to land, and that you would addreſs ſuch perſons in the language of the poet before cited. There is an obvious difference between a *direct charge* and an *hypothetical ſtatement*. I may ſay to my beſt friend, without fear of giving him offence; "If you were to "become a bad man, and diſgrace your charac- "ter, by acting ſuch or ſuch a part—I would "ſay ſo and ſo to you;" but, were I to tell him, that he *would* act ſuch a part, under ſuch circumſtances, I ſhould probably raiſe his juſt reſentment at the temerity of my conduct. Had

 the

the words to which I advert been ſpoken hypothetically, I am perſuaded they would not have given ſuch general offence.

You alſo ſay, "I fear, yea I believe, were the "French to come, and likely to prevail, that "ſome, if not many, both Baptiſts and Pædo-"baptiſts, and OTHERS, would join them;" which you explain in page 33 thus: "By Bap-"tiſts, Pædobaptiſts, and others, I include both "Churchmen and Diſſenters." But here, ſir, your memory has again failed you. It is in the recollection of many who heard you, that the terms Baptiſts and Pædobaptiſts ONLY, were uſed by you, and that the term OTHERS, was not uſed in the pulpit, at leaſt not in this connection. "Great numbers of Baptiſts, and great numbers "of Pædobaptiſts"—was your unqualified declaration, which declaration was underſtood at the time, (and who could underſtand it otherwiſe, that ſuppoſed you to poſſeſs common ſenſe?) to be pointed at Baptiſts, and Pædobaptiſt Diſſenters, without any reference whatever to *churchmen?* If theſe remarks be founded in truth, and I am ſtrongly inclined to think they are; how needleſs that interrogation—"Why let me aſk, "do they compel me to publiſh what I ſaid at "Broad-ſtreet to almoſt every pariſh in Great "Britain?" But if this be the caſe, it is pretty evident that not only what you *did ſay* at Broad-ſtreet, will have ſo extenſive a circulation, but

alſo

alſo what you *did not ſay*, and even what you *did not ſuppoſe*, will travel into almoſt every pariſh with equal ſpeed.

" Compel me to publiſh."—Who that knows Mr. M. will for a moment ſuppoſe he ſtood in need of compulſion to urge him to publiſh? Will they not rather imagine a return of his former complaint, the " cacoëthes ſcribendi," ſeized him *? The perſons alluded to in page 31, cannot be conſidered as having compelled you to publiſh. Their remonſtrances with you, on the impropriety of your conduct, were, I am perſuaded, the reſult of friendſhip. Whoever adviſed you to that meaſure, of him it may truly be ſaid, " an enemy has done this." Is there any juſt reaſon to conclude, that what you have been obliged to ſay in your own defence, will increaſe the reſpect of thoſe who know you? I ſpeak it with concern, *that* reſpect I am perſuaded is greatly diminiſhed, both at London and elſewhere, nor is this *defence* of your conduct much calculated to augment it in the judgment of thoſe whoſe good opinion is worth having.

On the letter you inſerted reſpecting your brethren at the Jamaica Coffee-houſe, and their ſubſequent viſit to you; I ſhall trouble you but with a few remarks. You diſmiſſed them, it ſeems, as " reſpectable friends," by aſſuring them, " that if any proper way could be deviſed to

* Vide the Life of the Rev. John Martin.

" prevent your intended publication, you would " willingly burn your papers; but if no ſuch " expedient could be found, you muſt pro- " ceed."

What the brethren at the Jamaica Coffee-houſe have ſince done, I am not informed, but I have a perfect reliance on their prudence and piety, that whatever ſteps they may think it right to take, will be with a ſtrict regard to what they deem the honour of true *religion*. Should their conduct not meet your approbation, (which probably it may not,) I truſt they will be able to juſtify themſelves to God and man.

This converſation ended, as many of yours have done, with ſtrong ſymptoms of your ſelf-importance and arrogance. If the gentlemen at Broad-ſtreet, to whoſe conduct I preſume you refer, " would retract what they had done, you " would ſuſpend your publication," or " burn " your papers." But, ſir, were they the aggreſſors? Or are you inſenſible that CALUMNY IS A VICE, and peculiarly offenſive in a man of your character? Have you forgotten that an apoſtle writing to Timothy, claſſes '*falſe accuſers*' in a liſt, where I am perſuaded you would not wiſh to be found? 2 Tim. iii. 3.

I know not by what ſtandard of morals, or of common ſenſe, you regulate your conduct—for my part, I can ſee nothing that could lead you for a moment to expect the gentlemen to retract, but an overweening opinion of that idol, SELF.

I now

I now addreſs myſelf to the taſk of commenting on the charge you have made—I wiſh to take it on your own ſtatement. You ſeem to conſider, that a miniſter being reſtrained from introducing politics into the pulpit, muſt prevent him from diſcharging a very important part of his duty. On this ſubject we are agreed. The obedience we owe to our rulers, is a branch of chriſtian duty: and, conſequently, a proper ſubject of inſtruction to chriſtian congregations. At proper times and ſeaſons, I object not to the ſober diſcuſſion of politics either in the pulpit or the parlour, provided it be done with moderation and temper—in the ſpirit which becomes the man and the chriſtian. I ſhould rejoice were every Briton a *politician*, and poſſeſſed a ſternneſs of virtue which would make his practice conformable to his judgment. I do not mean what is ſometimes underſtood by the term politician—a noiſy wrangling man, who pays great attention to public concerns, to the neglect of his own; but one who underſtands the conſtitution of his country, and labours, in his ſphere, to promote general happineſs.

I am not altogether unacquainted with your political views; nor with the aptitude you have diſcovered on many occaſions, both in public and private, of inculcating your ſentiments on the minds of others. I will not diſpute your ſincerity, but it is not every man who *thinks* he is right, that is really ſo—" I verily thought I ought to do

" many

" many things contrary to the name of Jeſus of " Nazareth"—was the language of Saul the perſecutor. It becomes us all to examine the grounds on which our opinions are formed, previous to action, leſt we ſhould be found like him, " kicking againſt the pricks."

The names republican, and infidel, ſeem, with you, ſynonymous terms. I deeply feel and regret the ſpread of infidelity, but I widely differ from you on the cauſes which have produced that baneful mental diſeaſe in a neighbouring country. The ſenſeleſs ceremonies, and ſuperſtitions of the Romiſh church, and the profligacy of her princes and her prieſts, I conſider as the grand cauſes of the wide ſpreading evil. Theſe, her apparent ſupporters, have at length opened the flood-gates of vice and immorality. Men, who were paid for appearing to be religious, have caſt off the forms, as they can no longer receive the emoluments derived from ſuperſtition. There were many of them not leſs infidels, under the maſk of religion, than they now are, when ſtripped of the covering. But allowing the French nation to be as wicked and profligate as you can poſſibly imagine—Where, ſir, is the evidence you poſſeſs, that any perſons under a profeſſion of religion here (for of ſuch you ſpeak) would join them? You ſay, p. 16. " I had nothing perſonal in view " in making uſe of theſe expreſſions." Why then, I would aſk, did you make them? They certainly were not neceſſary to the elucidation of your ſubject,

ject, and could anſwer no purpoſe, except the gratifying a temper and ſpirit inconſiſtent with the ſervice in which you were engaged; they were delivered in a way ſo direct and poſitive, as to rouſe an honeſt indignation in the breaſts of many who heard you. Yes, ſir, conſcious innocence may feel indignant at ſuch a charge; traduced and calumniated by one whoſe office it was to inſtruct. It would not have been ſurpriſing to me, had you been inſtantly called upon to name the parties. You ſurely loſt ſight, on this occaſion, of that maxim of an apoſtle, ' giving " no offence in any thing that the *miniſtry* be not " blamed," 2 Cor. vi. 3. You have given offence, and thereby the *Chriſtian miniſtry is blamed.*

Let me contraſt your language with that of the Biſhop of Llandaff, in his late Addreſs to the People of Great Britain; page 16, he ſays, " Many honeſt men, I am ſenſible, have been " alarmed into a belief, that were the French to " invade this country, they would be joined by " great numbers of diſcontented men—This is " not my opinion—That they would be joined " by a few of the worſt men in the country, by " thieves and robbers, and outcaſts of ſociety, is " probable enough, but that any individual, poſ- " ſeſſing either property or character, that any " reſpectable body of men would ſo far indulge " their diſcontents, as to ruin their country and " themſelves, in gratifying their reſentment, is

" what

" what nothing but experience can convince me " of:" and he further adds, page 17 and 18— " The diſſenters have, on trying occaſions, ſhewn " their attachment to the Houſe of Brunſwick, " and the principles of the revolution; and I " ſhould think myſelf guilty of calumny, if I " ſhould ſay, that they had in any degree aban- " doned either their attachment or their princi- " ples, or were diſpoſed to join the invaders of " their country." This ſtatement of the caſe is not only much more becoming the character of a chriſtian miniſter than your *belief*, but I am perſuaded it has that incomparable ingredient *Truth* for its foundation. The Diſſenters, it is true, ſo far as they enter into the ſpirit of real Chriſtianity, muſt ever be friends of *peace* and *reform*; but the ſame divine rule teaches them to " live " peaceable lives in all godlineſs and honeſty." They are not the diſturbers of the public peace, but the firm friends of order and ſubordination. It will not be denied that there have been ſome, called Diſſenters, that have not in every circumſtance conducted themſelves with all the prudence they ought to have done, (and your conduct, ſir, furniſhes an inſtance of the truth of this remark) and this has been an occaſion of great miſrepreſentation reſpecting them; but a ſmall degree of wiſdom will teach us, that general cenſures are not fairly to be founded on the conduct of a few imprudent individuals—" In " eventful periods, (ſays a ſenſible writer) there

" have

" have been great princes whom God has raiſed
" up for our deliverance, who ſaw, and acknow-
" ledged their perſonal obligation, and that of
" the ſtate, to them from whom we are de-
" ſcended."

Nor are the great body of Diſſenters of the preſent age, either *Infidels* or *Republicans*, and if Providence ſhould permit an invading foe to land on our coaſts (which, heaven forbid!)—I am perſuaded that no firmer ſupporters of His Majeſty's throne would be found, than among the Diſſenters—Yes, they have been the tried ſupporters of the Houſe of Brunſwick, and would ſtill riſk every thing that is dear to them in ſupport of that conſtitution, which in their earlieſt years they have been taught to revere; but ſhould this trying hour arrive, I ſuſpect that there are perſons who make loud profeſſions of loyalty, and are upon every occaſion ready to calumniate thoſe that may ſee objects through a different medium, a ſycophantic tribe, who would be looking out for perſonal, rather than national ſecurity.

Page 17. You obſerve—" That Diſſenters are
" not leſs contaminated with French principles,
" than other people, appeared to me incontro-
" vertible, and I could not imagine, to ſay ſuch
" was my belief, in any company, would have
" excited ſurpriſe."—But, ſir, if your charge from the pulpit is to be juſtified on any grounds, it muſt be on the ſuppoſition that Diſſenters are

*more contaminated* than others with French principles. But if you really thought this was the caſe, was the pulpit the moſt favourable place for publiſhing ſuch an accuſation? Surely not, unleſs you are of opinion (with ſome few among us) that whatever occurs to the mind during preaching, may be delivered, and thus the ſtation intended for the purpoſes of devotion and inſtruction, is made the vehicle of incoherence and folly.

But ſuch a repreſentation is doing injuſtice to the cauſe of Diſſenters—A conſcientious Diſſenter (and ſuch, I truſt, the majority of them will be found) is no friend to anarchy and confuſion—His Bible, which he aims to make the rule of his conduct, teaches him to " fear God, and honour " the King"—He is not a partialiſt in his conduct—while he is a friend to the liberties of mankind, and is grateful to God for the bleſſings and privileges he poſſeſſes, his breaſt is inſpired with the trueſt patriotiſm—His heart is warmed with the love of his country—He mourns over whatever, in his view, has a tendency to injure its true intereſts—Deeply impreſſed with a conviction, that " ſin is a reproach to a " people," he ſighs for the abominations that are done in the land—In the tenor of his conduct he ſeeks to promote that " righteouſneſs which " exalteth a nation"—" knowing that Salvation " is of the Lord." When his country is in danger from

from foreign or domeſtic foes, the language of his heart, when lifted up to the Great Supreme, is,

" Amidſt our iſle exalted high,
" Do thou our glory ſtand;
" And like a wall of guardian fire,
" Surround our native land."

DR. WATTS.

Page 14. You ſay, " I freely own I do not " approve of theſe terms—Diſſenting Intereſt;" nor ſhould I, ſir, if that intereſt were to be conſidered either as " *unfriendly to*, or *unmindful of the* " *general welfare*." But you well know that theſe expreſſions were not ſo conſidered by the gentlemen who uſed them, nor are they capable of ſuch a conſtruction, except by a perverſeneſs of reaſoning to me inexplicable. I ceaſe to wonder at any thing you ſay, if you can cordially believe them in a ſenſe ſo oppoſite to their general acceptation. And yet, ſir, page 35, you ſay, " Am I not a Diſſenter? Have I not " been ſo for almoſt forty years? If I have any " honour, any earthly intereſt, any pleaſing friend- " ſhips, have I not all this as a Diſſenting Mi- " niſter?"

A Diſſenting Miniſter! and yet not approving of the terms *diſſenting intereſt*, is ſurely a ſoleciſm. Why do we ſeparate from the hierarchy of our country? We feel, I preſume, objections to the *doctrines* or *diſcipline* of the eſtabliſhed religion,

and hence we become Diſſenters. If we do this from conviction, and not from education or habit, we certainly become the ſupporters of the diſſenting intereſt, or we have little title to the name of diſſenters. As our convictions are genuine, they urge us to a greater or leſs degree of activity, in promoting that intereſt we have ourſelves embraced. The promotion of this intereſt is by no means hoſtile either to church or ſtate, as you would ſeem to inſinuate, for " the weapons of " this warfare are not carnal." But a Diſſenter, armed with his Bible as his panoply, may fairly plead for and promote the " diſſenting intereſt;" nor will he be leſs ſolicitous to abſtain from every thing that might ſubject that intereſt to reproach and contempt. Why then, ſir, do you affect to ſneer at the terms diſſenting intereſt, as you have been, you ſay, a Diſſenter for nearly forty years? Is not this unbecoming your character and profeſſion? Do you not give us juſt occaſion to ſay, " A man's enemies are thoſe of his own houſe-" hold?" Does not your conduct too much reſemble his, whom the wiſe man deſcribes as ſcattering firebrands, arrows, and death? As to your honour and friendſhips as a Diſſenting Miniſter, whatever they may have been, I ſuſpect both the one and the other are much on the wane. Yes, have you not wounded the ſpirits of many whoſe friendſhips was your honour, and the loſs of which you are not likely to repair, by the addition

addition of that which your late conduct may gain?

In truth, ſir, you ſeem ſo much elevated by LATE OCCURRENCES, that you cannot diſtinguiſh between *calumny* and *faithfulneſs*;—yet what power inveſted you with the authority of being a "*divider and a judge?*"

In offering theſe remarks on your late publication, I am not actuated by a ſpirit of contention, but induced to ſubmit them to public notice, in juſtice to a numerous body of Proteſtant Diſſenters—in juſtice to our ſuperiors in power, who are in danger of being miſled, (if they read your publication;) and in whoſe eyes I wiſh them to appear only as they *have been* and *really are*.—I will add alſo, with the hope, however faint, of convincing you, that you have violated the rule of chriſtian charity, which "thinketh no evil." Notwithſtanding your conduct upon this occaſion, I nevertheleſs conſider you to be—a *good*—though a *miſtaken* man; the truth of the caſe—in my apprehenſion is—that the patronage of which you have of late ſo much boaſted, has ſo elevated you in your own eſteem—that you have forgotten that the true dignity of a miniſter of Jeſus Chriſt conſiſts not in the loftineſs of his deportment—nor in the ideas he may entertain of his own importance, but in copying the example of his Divine Maſter, who was "meek "and lowly in heart," and the tenor of whoſe demeanour

demeanour was, " peace on earth, and good will " towards men,"—that ſuch may be your employment is my ſincere wiſh—and that you may obtain the teſtimony of a good conſcience—that you have aimed to promote the honour of him whoſe " kingdom is not of this world."

In page 36, you intimate an apprehenſion, that the Calviniſtic doctrines of your ſermon, might render it unpopular to ſome who heard it. How unbecoming is this inſinuation? Look to the liſt of reſpectable miniſters, who are engaged in the lecture at Broad-ſtreet; men who are conſpicuous for their attachment to evangelical truth; and ſome of whom have written defences of its doctrines, which do honour both to the heads and the hearts of the authors. Does this look in any reſpect like a derelict̃ion of ſentiment on the part of the ſupporters of the lecture? Many of them I know, and I believe they have as firm a conviction as you can poſſeſs, that the doctrines called Calviniſtic, are admirably adapted to promote the glory of God, and the happineſs of ſinful men. By ſuppoſing a change of ſentiment to have taken place, and this to have been a circumſtance unfavourable to your ſermon; Do you not ſeem rather to claim to yourſelf the honour of being the moſt diſtinguiſhed aſſertor of divine truth?—What remarkable modeſty is this?—After all the pains that have been taken, to ſpread unfounded alarms of the diſaffection of Proteſtant

Proteſtant Diſſenters: have they not reaſon to apprehend that perſons in power may be led to look upon them with an eye of ſuſpicion? If ſo, I truſt that this will be but a momentary impreſſion. Such repreſentations do not deſerve credit; and I hope they will not obtain it. His Majeſty in his anſwer to the addreſs of the Proteſtant Diſſenting Miniſters, on his providential eſcape from the hand of inſanity, ſays, *That he has a firm dependance upon their ſteady attachment to his family and government; and that they may be aſſured of his protection, in the enjoyment of their civil and religious liberties.* Theſe ſentiments which were befitting the occaſion, and the monarch who delivered them, are, I truſt, ſtill prevalent in the royal breaſt; and I hope that every attempt to perſuade his Majeſty, that the Proteſtant Diſſenters are leſs deſerving of his countenance and regard, at the preſent than at any former period of his reign, will not only fail of accompliſhing its object, but ſubject the culumniator to the contempt his conduct deſerves.

I conclude by ſaying of Proteſtant Diſſenters, they know and admire the conſtitution of their country—they are warm and ſteady in their attachment to the perſon and family of their Sovereign—and notwithſtanding the miſrepreſentations which are gone forth, and the prejudices too ſucceſsfully raiſed againſt them—I have a perfect

perfect confidence in the wisdom and justice of the British nation—that in the moment of calm reflection, they will be ranked among THE GUARDIANS OF CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

A PROTESTANT DISSENTER.

*March* 17, 1798.

5 0059